

REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Final Office Action dated July 31, 2008, within two months. Accordingly, Applicants request an Advisory Action, if necessary. The Examiner rejects all pending claims 5, 7-12 and 51-57. Applicants cancel claim 7 without prejudice or disclaimer to filing one or more claims having similar subject matter. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview held with Applicants' patent attorney David Nigro on August 14, 2008. Applicants also thank the Examiner for acknowledging that the cited references do not disclose or contemplate "at least one of editing and removing at least a portion of said executable commands such that said executable commands still remain in said trusted portion, but cannot be executed by said network client," as recited in amended independent claims 5 and 57, and that such a claim is supported by the present specification.

It appears from the outstanding Office Action that the Examiner did not consider the editing clause when analyzing the cited references in light of the pending rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner re-analyze the cited references in light of all of the pending claim elements which are adequately supported by the specification, as set forth below.

Rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 5, 7-12, 51-57

The Examiner rejects claims 5, 7-12, 51-57 as failing to comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In particular, the Examiner believes that there is no support for "editing at least a portion of said executable commands such that said executable commands still remain in said trusted portion, but cannot be executed by said network client." Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as set forth below.

Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to, for example, paragraphs [0099], [0101], Figure 13, and the claims as originally filed on April 9, 2004 of the present specification. Paragraph [0099], when referring to Figure 13, discloses that:

To prevent this potential security problem, various embodiments of the invention suitably include techniques for reducing or eliminating undesired executable code. With reference to FIG. 13, a process 1300 for reducing the likelihood of script attacks suitably includes the steps of limiting the portions of the server having elevated permission (step 1302),

removing dangerous characters within that portion of the site (step 1304), encoding certain characters where necessary (step 1306), and optionally logging data that is provided to users from the relevant portion of the Web site (step 1308). [emphasis added].

Paragraph [0101] further discloses that:

In addition to (or as an alternative to) configuring the client such that the client only "trusts" a certain portion of the server, the server may be configured to improve the security of the client-server interaction. For example, scripting with heightened trust may be disallowed on most of the server to improve security. Moreover, **data provided to the trusted portion of the Web site may be monitored and/or modified before being returned to the user (steps 1304 and 1306).** Most scripting languages require certain characters for formatting commands. For example, the JavaScript language is frequently encoded with script instructions placed between angle brackets ("**<**" and "**>**"). Hence, **the angle brackets may be removed from any content that will be returned by a trusted portion of the Web site.** If a Web page provided from a trusted portion of the Web site were to include a "criminal" JavaScript program attempting to use angle brackets, for example, **the script instructions would not execute** on the user's computer because the script instructions **would not be properly formatted after removing the angle brackets.** Alternatively, certain "dangerous" characters (such as the angle brackets in JavaScript) **may be returned in an alternate format,** for example, in "ampersand notation" with an ampersand ("&") and an American Standard Code for Information Interchange (ASCII) value for the particular character, or by replacing the "dangerous" character with a safe character, such as the "space" character (step 1306). It will be appreciated that any characters could be eliminated or encoded in various embodiments of the invention depending upon the particular languages, scripting environments, and the like that may be utilized. [emphasis added].

Further still, original claim 6 included, at least, "removing said particular characters such that a security risk posed by said selected protocol is reduced" and original claim 7 included, at least, "replacing said particular characters with benign characters such that a security risk posed by said selected protocol is reduced."

Applicants respectfully submit that the above portions of the present specification, among others, satisfy the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 8-12 and 51-56, variously depend from independent claim 5, so Applicants assert that dependent claims 8-12 and 51-56 are patentable for at least the same reasons as set forth above for independent claim 5, as well as in view of their own respective features. Independent claim 57 contains similar language as claim 5 and is thus supported by, among other things, the portions of the present specification cited above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 7 is currently canceled, so Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 7 is moot.

Rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5, 7-12, 51-57

The Examiner rejects claims 5, 7-12, 51-57 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,473,794 to Guheen (“Guheen”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,913,024 to Green (“Green”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as set forth below.

As discussed in the previous Reply to Office Action filed on April 17, 2008, Guheen discloses methods for planning the testing of components of an existing network framework. (See Abstract). Guheen teaches the separation of testing environments to prevent unauthorized access. (See columns 58-59). Green discloses a secure server system and method using a plurality of regions that comprise separate networking protocol stacks. (See Abstract, column 7, lines 56-59). Green discloses that, to prevent attack, a server application may be executed by a user other than root. (See column 29, line 3). Both Guheen and Green discuss computer security issues, including the undesirability of unauthorized access to secure systems.

However, Guheen and Green do not disclose or contemplate, at least, “at least one of editing and removing at least a portion of said executable commands such that said executable commands still remain in said trusted portion, but cannot be executed by said network client, wherein said editing of said executable commands comprises replacing particular characters within said executable commands” as recited in the present claim 5.

Dependent claims 8-12 and 51-56, variously depend from independent claim 5, so Applicants assert that dependent claims 8-12 and 51-56 are patentable for at least the same reasons for differentiating the independent claim 5, as well as in view of their own respective features. Independent claim 57 contains similar language as claim 5. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 7 is currently canceled so Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 7 is moot.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience, if that would help further prosecution of the subject application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. **This statement does NOT authorize charge of the issue fee.**

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/30/08

By: 
Howard I. Sobelman, Reg. No. 39,038

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
One Arizona Center, 400 East Van Buren
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202
Phone: (602) 382-6228 / Fax: (602) 382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com